

Remarks/Arguments

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the telephone conversation of December 7, 2007.

This application has two independent claims: claims 1 and 23.

The Examiner rejected claim 23 as anticipated by Miotto.

Claim 23, as amended, requires “one of said cam and said slidable bearing having a protuberance, and the other of said cam and said slidable bearing having a corresponding indentation; said sliding bearing member sliding in a direction such that, when said cam is (i) at said first rotation limit, (ii) at said second rotation limit, and at each of all possible positions between said first rotation limit and said second rotation limit, said protuberance extends within said indentation”.

Miotto has a cam with a protuberance and a bearing member with an indentation, however, the protuberance does not extend within the indentation “(i) at said first rotation limit, (ii) at said second rotation limit, and at each of all possible positions between said first rotation limit and said second rotation limit”.

Since the combination of references lacks this feature of claim 23, it is submitted that claim 23, as amended, is not anticipated by Miotto.

The Examiner rejected claim 1 as obvious over US5,676,425 to Pernicka in view of US6,213,522 to Miotto.

Claim 1 requires “a vertically slidable bearing member having a surface engaging said cam and an opposite surface slidably engaging an abutment such that said bearing member slides along said abutment when sliding vertically”.

The Examiner asserts that Pernicka has a vertically slidable bearing member having a surface engaging a cam and an opposite surface engaging an abutment . However that may be, Pernicka has no “bearing member” that “slides along said abutment when sliding vertically”, as required by claim 1, as amended.

It is therefore submitted that the combination of references lacks a feature of claim 1 such that the references do not give rise to a *prima facie* case of obviousness in respect of the claim.

The Examiner rejected claim 23 as obvious over US5,676,425 to Pernicka in view of US6,213,522 to Miotto.

Claim 23, as amended, requires “one of said cam and said slidable bearing having a protuberance, and the other of said cam and said slidable bearing having a corresponding indentation; said sliding bearing member sliding in a direction such that, when said cam is (i) at said first rotation limit, (ii) at said second rotation limit, and at each of all possible positions between said first rotation limit and said second rotation limit, said protuberance extends within said indentation”.

Pernicka has no protuberance or indentation on either of its bearing member or its cam. Miotto has a cam with a protuberance and a bearing member with an indentation, however, the protuberance does not extend within the indentation “(i) at said first rotation limit, (ii) at said second rotation limit, and at each of all possible positions between said first rotation limit and said second rotation limit”.

Since the combination of references lacks this feature of claim 23, it is submitted that the references do not give rise to a *prima facie* case of obviousness in respect of the claim.

On the basis that the independent claims patentably define over the art of record, the remaining claims, which depend from one or other of the independent claims, also patentably define over the art of record.

In view of the foregoing, early favourable consideration of this application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/SCOTT B. STROHM/

Scott B. Strohm
Registration No. 42172

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, Missouri 64108-2613
Tel: (816) 474-6550
Fax: (816) 421-5547

December 18, 2007

(05171-132 RDF:bw)